REMARKS

The final Office Action dated September 15, 2008 has been reviewed carefully and this Amendment is being filed pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §116 as an amendment after final rejection. It is believed that the Amendment places the claims in condition for allowance.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §101

At Paragraph 5 of the Office Action, Claims 20-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 on the grounds that the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claims 20-21 have been amended to recite: *A computer readable medium configured as a database management system for producing reports of attributes of collections of computers using computer profile data contained in a database.*

Claim 20 has been further amended to recite *a profile group manager running on an associated computer.* The Examiner notes that only if at least one of the claimed elements of the system is a physical part of a device can the system as claimed constitute part of a device or a combination of devices to be a machine within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §101. The profile group manager is recited as running on an associated computer, and the claim as a whole is a computer readable medium configured as a database management system. It is respectfully submitted that Claims 20 and 21, as amended herein, recite a machine within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §101, and are thus in condition for allowance.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C.§103

At paragraph 7 of the Office Action, Claims 1-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C.

§103 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,295,527 to McCormack et al.,

("McCormack"), further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,098,067 to Erickson ("Erickson").

Applicant's invention as claimed in amended independent claim 1 comprises in

part;

A method of managing a computer information database that contains computer profile data for computers, the method including the steps of:

A. determining a multiple node tree structure of groups for the computers, in which each node is a group level and a top level is a root, based on primary grouping criteria and secondary grouping criteria that correspond to selected computer profile data;

B. including, in a group mapping table, one or more fields for the primary grouping criteria and one or more fields for the secondary grouping criteria, and including in those fields, respective table records, *values corresponding to the selected computer profile data that are utilized in the primary grouping and the secondary grouping criteria with the values associated with either or both of the primary grouping criteria and the secondary grouping criteria being ranges that extend between selected high and low values, and wherein certain specific values for said primary grouping criteria and said secondary grouping criteria together uniquely identify one or more particular computers*;

C. further including, in the respective table records, information that identifies the groups to which the computers that satisfy the primary and secondary criteria are assigned;

D. receiving, for inclusion in the database, computer profile data from a plurality of computers;

E. for the profile data from a given computer
    extracting the selected profile data that are utilized in the primary groupings and the secondary groupings,
    querying the group mapping table to determine if the extracted profile data correspond to or fall within the ranges of the respective values that are included in the primary grouping fields and the secondary grouping fields in any of the records in the table, and

if the query results in no records, assigning the computer to a default group,

-if the query results in one table record, assigning the computer to the group that is named in the record,

if the query results in multiple table records that include secondary low values, assigning the computer to the group that is named in the record that is in a first predetermined position in the order in which the records are returned, or

if the query results in multiple records and there are no corresponding secondary low values in the records, assigning the computer to the group that is named in the record that is in a second predetermined position in the order in which the records are returned; and

F. *manipulating the computer profile data from the database and producing, for a selected group level, reports that contain summaries of certain or all of the attributes of the computers that are in the selected group level or below in the tree.*

McCormack describes mechanisms for establishing and viewing groups of devices within a network of devices that uses a filter metadata table that provides a set of filters and filter criteria that can be selected by a user. However, as stated in earlier prosecution, McCormack does not disclose, teach or suggest Applicant's *values associated with either or both of the primary grouping criteria and the secondary grouping criteria being ranges that extend between selected high and low values.*

The Examiner's Response to Arguments at Page 27 of the Office Action at Paragraph J states that McCormack discloses ranges of values of computer profile data, that is, ranges that extend selected high and low values of the computer profile data as seen in Col. 12, lines 6-24.

However, lines 6- 10 of that passage states: "For example, if Device Type values 7300 and 7500 are both selected by a user from the filter dialog 210, the filter mechanism 126 interprets the user's selection as requesting information about all network devices

that are 7300 *or* 7500 device types." (Emphasis added) Notably, the filter mechanism is designed to search for device types in a disjunctive "or" manner, *not* device types that are within and between 7300 and 7500. Thus, McCormack's filter does not search for devices within a range as in Applicant's invention which can search, for example, for IP addresses within a specified range.

In addition, in the Response to Arguments, the Examiner indicates that Erickson's "groups are based on double feature as they are grouped in respect to language and processor type." In contrast, Applicant's invention provides primary grouping criteria and secondary grouping criteria that can identify the device, not simply whether the device uses a particular language or a processor type. Just specifying "German" and "Alpha" as in Erickson's Fig. 5, does not identify a unique device. Applicant's primary and secondary groupings can not only retrieve a group of devices but, if programmed accordingly, can identify particular devices.

In addition to the arguments presented in earlier prosecution, Applicant notes that neither reference allows each computer to be uniquely identified in a structure that reflects the organization of the company, such as by using identifiers including the PC Name and corporate department such as sales, marketing, headquarters and the like, and which make the name unique. For example, as stated on Page 10, lines 6 – 9 of Applicant's Specification, "[T]he grouping mimics both a company's organizational structure and its underlying physical set up. The company uses structured PC Names that include three letters followed by four digits. The three letters denote the organizational responsibilities of the computer's user, and the numbers make the name unique." Thus, there are specific values for the primary grouping and secondary grouping criteria which

identify a unique computer.

Neither McCormack nor Erickson discloses, teaches or suggests *values corresponding to the selected computer profile data that are utilized in the primary grouping criteria and the secondary grouping criteria with the values associated with either or both of the primary grouping criteria and the secondary grouping criteria being ranges that extend between selected high and low values and wherein certain specific values for said primary grouping criteria and said secondary grouping criteria together uniquely identify one or more particular computers*. Furthermore, the combination of McCormack's filter mechanisms with Erickson's criteria including language and processor type does not disclose, teach or suggest this feature, nor does the combination disclose teach or suggest *manipulating the computer profile data from the database and producing, for a selected group level, reports that contain summaries of certain or all of the attributes of the computers that are in the selected group level or below in the tree*.

Furthermore, in order to enhance the claims and clarify the distinctions which the present invention has over the cited references, Applicant has amended the independent claims to recite that *certain specific values for the primary grouping and the secondary grouping criteria together uniquely identify one or more computers.*

Support for this Amendment can be found at the Specification at Page 7, lines 10-13 and Figure 5, and at Page 10, lines 6 -12.

Neither McCormack nor Erickson discloses, teaches or suggests *certain specific values for the primary grouping and the secondary grouping criteria together uniquely identify one or more computers.*

It is respectfully submitted that based upon the amendments and arguments presented herein and in earlier prosecution, amended independent claim 1 is now in condition for allowance. Similarly, independent claims 7, 12 and 20 have been amended with similar language and thus it is believed that claims 7, 12 and 20, as amended, are also in condition for allowance.

Accordingly, all independent claims are believed to be in condition for allowance.

All dependent claims are dependent from independent claims which are believed to be in condition for allowance. Accordingly, all dependent claims are believed to be in condition for allowance.

Favorable action is respectfully solicited.

Please charge any additional fee occasioned by this paper to our Deposit Account No. 03-1237.

Respectfully submitted,

  /Rita M. Rooney/
Rita M. Rooney
Reg. No. 30,585
CESARI AND MCKENNA, LLP
88 BLACK FALCON AVENUE
BOSTON, MA 02210
Telephone: (617) 951-2500
Facsimile: (617) 951-3927